DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 309 792 JC 880 555

AUTHOR Savage, Kenneth M., Jr.
TITLE Comprehensive Planning: A Management Process. ACCCA Management Report 1988-89/1.
INSTITUTION Association of California Community Coll. Administrators.
PUB DATE 88
NOTE 17p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Administration; *College Planning; Community Colleges; Decentralization; Information Dissemination; *Master Plans; *Participative Decision Making; Program Descriptions; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS *Yosemite Community College District CA

ABSTRACT

The Yosemite Community College District's comprehensive planning process involves a year-round cycle of activities. The cycle begins in September after the budget for the current year has been approved, the prior year's activity has been closed out, and the primary planning document, "The Atlas," has been completed. The district chancellor initiates the cycle by distributing philosophical and procedural guidelines, "The Atlas," forms, and general instructions to all unit/division managers. From September to November, the managers work with the members of their units to develop individual plans for their divisions. By mid-December, work begins on reconciling the unit plans into overall college and central services plans. The first draft of the tentative district plan is submitted to the Chancellor of the California Community Colleges in April. Between April and July, modifications are made as feedback is received from the chancellor's office and as the next year's appropriations are more accurately determined. In September, the final plan is adopted by the district's board and the new cycle begins. Broad-based support for the plan is achieved through full staff involvement and the use of committees composed of faculty, support staff, management, and administration. After utilizing the process for several years, the district recognizes several benefits, including improved communication, decentralization of day-to-day decision making, and centralization of information. Plans have been developed for improving the process through expansion of research activities, leadership development, evaluation techniques, and other efforts. (AYC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED309792

Management Report

1988-89/1

COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING — A MANAGEMENT PROCESS

by

Kenneth M. Savage, Jr.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

K. M. Savage

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ACCCA **Your Professional Association**

Association of California Community College Administrators

JC 880 555

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

FOREWORD

More than ever before in our history, community colleges are recognizing--and responding to--the need for better educational planning. Factors such as reduced funding, competition for available resources, and an increasing insistence on accountability have focused attention on planning (including the related evaluation components) as a basic requirement for improving all college programs and services. Indeed, the revision of accreditation standards to reinforce this need clearly demonstrates the central role it has assumed as a measure of institutional effectiveness.

Almost ten years ago the Yosemite Community College District began to explore ways to improve organizational planning. By now, many ACCCA members have been introduced to this District's Comprehensive Plan through presentations at the Annual Conference and elsewhere around the State. This Management Report develops in greater detail the background and essential elements of the comprehensive planning process at both college and district levels.

Kenneth Savage completed his higher education at California Polytechnic State University in San Luis Obispo, taught agriculture at the high school level, and then spent 15 years at West Hills College in Coalinga as an Instructor, Division Chair, and Dean of Instruction. From 1979 to 1986 he served as Director of Resource Development for the Yosemite Community College District, where he worked with specially funded programs, data and information systems, and coordinated the development of the district's planning process. During this period and subsequent to his retirement, he was intimately involved in assisting with the statewide comprehensive planning pilot study.

Mr. Savage is currently president of C&M Facilitators, Incorporated, a consulting firm specializing in facilitating the work of local districts and other organizations in planning and other management activities.

Ray Liedlich
Columbia College
Editor, ACCCA
Management Reports

Editorial Review Board

Jack Bessire
Monterey Peninsula College

Ione Elioff
Solano Community College

Bill Vega
Coastline Community College

COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING - A MANAGEMENT PROCESS

Plans are nothing. Planning is everything.
- Dwight Eisenhower

Or perhaps said in another way. The process is more important than the product.

The *idea* of planning is certainly not new. As George Keller notes in his book Academic Strategy, Plato's *Republic* is a plan. Why is it then that there is currently such interest in planning? It's almost as though some breakthrough has occured. Why haven't we learned all there is to learn about planning many years, centuries ago? Could it be because planning is an activity of people? One which cannot be perfected, but rather changes as people change?

Somehow in most endeavors the concept of planning emerges. As we Americans see our accustomed number one position in know-how and ability-to-get-the-job-done slipping to number two or even number three in some areas of activity, considerable review of how we do things is occuring. It is inevitable then that how we make decisions, how we *plan*, is being looked at in all sectors of our economic and social undertakings, including education.

In recent years considerable discussion has been held relative to the respective merits of *Management Science* versus *Incrementalism*. These names are an attempt to describe what could be termed the extremes of planning approaches. The practioner of management science is committed to the use of information, simulations, and forecasts to make rational, data-grounded decisions. Sometimes refered to as rational-economic in approach reflecting a concern for the future; what is to be done next; a penchant for problems that can be quantified.

The incrementalists on the other hand believe that no one can predict the future. That change comes about through hundreds of tiny steps, no one of which is great enough to rock the boat. Incrementalism is described by George Keller as partisan-political. He quotes George Santanya as saying "The working of a great institution is mainly the result of a vast amount of routine, petty malice, self-interest, carelessness and sheer mistake. Only a residual fraction is thought." Sound like home?

The current buzz-word in the realm of planners is *Strategic Planning* which supposedly lies somewhere between the ability to quantify and through the use of scientific analysis accurately predict the future and reliance upon waiting to see *what they do to us*, the traditional approach to educational planning.

This paper will define the process used in the Yosemite Community College District to develop an annual operational plan for allocation of resources utilizing the strengths of management science (data and information), the projections and predictions from the strategists while accomodating the incrementalists. Is that possible? We think so. It isn't easy. It takes time. According to Tom Van Groningen, chancellor of the Yosemite district, the two distinctive qualities of leadership required are *patience and perserverence.*

What has grown to be called the Comprehensive Planning process in the Yosemite district is built upon some rather strong convictions which have evolved out of a great deal of study, developmental activity, trial and error over nearly seven years. At this point it can be said that, at least, the major necessary elements of a sound planning process are in place and funtioning.

1. A reliable information system including a research component.

2. An effective, decentralized, easily accessed budget and accounting system with related purchasing, accounts payable, payroll and personnel systems.

3. A process for developing operational plans at the unit, college/central services levels which can be pulled together into an overall district plan. (See list of planning support materials at the end of this document)

4. Participation in the pilot effort to incorporate state required planning into a single comprehensive district plan.

5. The beginning of an effort to bring into play the strategic aspect of true planning; judging the future.

This contrasts with the past approach which was the more traditional reliance upon reaction to primarily, external stimuli (funding, enrollment etc.) and internal inertia and self-interest.

Why has the Yosemite district embarked upon these new, somewhat unique, undertakings? Probably mainly due to the changed nature of *things*. We are no longer dealing with new frontiers with unlimited expansion into new territory. We have to live in the same house (campus) in the same town. We are no longer able to solve problems through moving on, adding, ignoring, picking up the next new unfilled need.

And this is not unique to Yosemite. Planning is much in the news these days. Over thirty districts have come forward voluntariily over the last few years to express an interest in working on the development of a statewide comprehensive planning

process. Many of these districts are exploring the development of local planning systems.

An underlying theme seems to run through much of the material which these districts are developing; the need to respond in an orgainized manner to change. And many are approaching the process through the development of some type of information (data) base. Pamila Fisher developed an analysis for Modesto Junior College in 1984 entitled "Planning for the Future". The Kern district using the services of John Collins, president emeritus of Bakersfield College produced, also in 1984, a document, "A Basis for Planning" which provides a comprehensive data base for decision-making. Janis Coffey of the Los Rios District published a document in 1984 called "Planning for Change" also a very comprehensive look at the changing environment within and without that district. Chuck McIntyre of the Chancellor's Office brought out "Contours of Change" in 1985 which is a portrayal of change factors affecting community colleges in California as seen by a study group of representatives from the educational field.

Obviously the interest is there, and one could make the assumption from this that a need exists also, for improvement in the way in which decisions affecting community college operations are made. Why hasn't more been done? Mainly because planning is not an easy process even though we all *plan* in that we make decisions which affect the course of future events; in that sense we plan every day. What then creates the interest in a more formal process? Does security derive from structure? Do most of us have a warm spot for bureaucracy? Or do we truly desire to make improvements?

The answer is probably in there somewhere. We do want to improve. We do need the security of a *process*. We would like to get out in front of events and exert more control over our institutional destiny and our personal stake in it; as scary and lonely as it may be out there in the future!

The Yosemite Community College District Comprehensive Planning Process addresses many of these issues. A description of the process follows.

The District

The Yosemite Community College District is located in the heart of California stretching from the rich agricultural land of the San Joaquin Valley to the western slope of the Sierra Nevada. It encompasses about 4,500 square miles. Although serving primarily Stanislaus, Tuolumne and Calaveras counties, the District also includes portions of San Joaquin, Santa Clara and Merced counties.

The total population of the District was 359,109 in 1985 and is projected to reach over 400,000 by 1990. This population is comprised of approximately 82% White, 14% Hispanic, 1% Black and 3% Asian/Other Americans of whom on the average about 4.5% are enrolled in college programs.

The District has two colleges on three campuses; Modesto Junior College located in Modesto with two main campuses and Columbia College located in the foothills of Tuolumne County near the towns of Sonora and Columbia. In the Spring of 1987 Modesto had 14,757 different individuals enrolled and Columbia had 4,244. The difference in size of the Colleges and the distance between them, over sixty miles, are factors to which comprehensive planning has responded very positively. The totally integrated data base and computer network giving all users on-line, real-time access to records and information also assists in planning and managing.

The Calendar

Planning in the Yosemite district is a continuum of activity occuring, literally, year round (Refer to the "ANNUAL PLANNING TIMELINE" at the end of this document) Each cycle *begins* in September of each year. At that time the current year budget has been finalized. The prior year's activity has been closed out and the results of that activity have been made available in information summaries. The primary planning base document, The Atlas, has been completed and copies are available for distribution. To set the cycle in motion the District Chancellor distributes the planning materials to all unit managers. A unit manager is that person responsible for supervision of a specifically designated area of activity. For example at Modesto Junior College division chairs are unit managers; in Central Services the director of buildings and grounds is a unit manager. Units are derived from the adiministrative structure of the District and vary considerably among the colleges and central services in size and internal management procedures. Generally, units are departments or divisions or some combination of those.

Along with the planning guidelines, Atlas, forms and general instructions the Chancellor also distributes the Board of Trustees revised Philosophical Guidelines which have been prepared by the Board working in an all-day workshop session during the preceding August. In addition copies of what are termed Planning Assumptions will be distributed. These assumptions have been derived from discussions among staff and the Chancellor designed to bring out the institution's best judgement as to how various environmental factors will affect the district and what the general response should be.

During September, October, November unit managers throughout the district work with their unit members in developing

individual unit plans. An emphasis is placed upon involvement of *all* staff members in the decision making process. This has been an area of activity which has required special training sessions and continuous oversight by administrative personnel in order to attempt full implementation. Work still remains but progress is being made. As would be expected different unit managers have different management styles. Full staff involvement in the decision-making process comes more naturally for some than others. The districtwide Comprehensive Planning Advisory Committtee to the Chancellor, a broadly based committee repeesenting staff at all levels, certificated, classified and management, continues to stress the necessity for vigilance in assuring full staff involvement. One factor promoting such involvement is the example set by college presidents and other top level administrative personnel.

Generally, unit plans are completed by the middle of December and work then begins on the next phase, the reconciliation of the unit plans into overall college and central services plans. Experience has shown that the unit plans generally reflect what the units feel they need to operate optimum programs. In spite of early fears, unit plans are not extravagant or excessive but rather reflect good judgement and concientious effort at defining goals and activities and what will be required in the way of resources to reach those goals.

The work of removing redundancy in competing plans, reducing the scope of activity to come within allowable resources is not easy. We have found, however, that with the information now available through the planning process and with the interchange and involvement of staff, tradeoffs can be made, resources can be directed for maximum benefit and personnel can willingly support the final decisions made. They may not like the decisions but they understand them and will support their implementation.

With the district's participation in the Statewide Comprehensive Planning process the target date for development of individual College and Central Services plans, was about March 15. This allowed approximately two weeks for staff to combine the plans into the first draft of the Tentative District Plan which was submitted to the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office shortly after April 1. With the advent of the early calendar and an earlier start on the planning process the target date was set back to February 15 to allow more time for staff to prepare and review the first draft.

During the interval from April 1 through July 1 additional modifications were made to the plan as feedback was received from the state chancellor's office and available resources were more accurately determined. These revisions were then incorporated so that the final draft of the Tentative Plan and its included budget could be adopted by the Yosemite board of trustees in July to set up the initial plan and budget for the

new year. Whether or not comprehensive planning is adopted statewide, the Yosemite district will proceed in approximately the same manner except for the state submittals.

From July through August to the Board meeting in September some, usually minor, adjustments are made to the plan. At its September meeting the Final Plan will be adopted and a new cycle will begin.

The Players

If it is true that the process is more important than the product it should follow that change must occur during the process. We have found this to be true. Peoples' attitudes change. Decisions are made, directions established, priorities set; all factors which affect attitude. Accepting this, then the people involved, *the players,* become all-important.

Peters and Waterman writing in their book In Search of Excellence comment about the elimination of planning departments in many major corporations. Not the elimination of planning, but the elimination of specialists responsible for the direction of the company and making it the responsibility of everyone to plan and be involved in directing the company. The same circumstances apply to education. The more people involved the more people who will *buy into* the plan and the more effective will be its implementation.

We have learned in the Yosemite district that the beginning point in developing meaningful involvement of staff is to establish mutual trust and understanding among *all* staff members at all levels within the institution. This is often talked about and sometimes professed but its real achievement is very difficult. We do not claim to have reached perfection but we do feel considerable progress has been made.

How did we achieve involvement? Through a long, slow evolution. The stage was set in the early stages of development of the planning process when cross-sectional committees with representatives of faculty, support staff, management and administration and for a time students were involved. Initially, mistrust was plentiful, doubt was in evidence and commitment was limited at best. However, over time through working together on a project which gathered momentum as it progressed, mutual respect and appreciation began to emerge and even a certain level of camaraderie. A major contributing factor during this time was the element of openness, displayed by central services staff in response to the leadership of the district chancellor, Tom Van Groningen. Ted Hamilton, a geography instructor and faculty leader at Modesto Junior College and a member of the early developmental team has often referred to what he sees as a turning point for him in the process. In an effort to start from a factual base the developmental committee decided to determine

what kind of information suitable for planning was already in existence. Mr. Hamilton's assignment was to look into the availability of financial information about the district. To his initial surprise the district business manager literally opened the books to his review. In a subsequent conversation with the chancellor, Mr. Hamilton asked about this apparent change in attitude. The chancellor's response was "no, not really a change,in my opinion if we are doing something which cannot stand the light of day then we shouldn't be doing it". For Ted Hamilton and for that matter, all the rest of us that set the tone which has been built upon throughout the developmental process.

From this it derives then that successful planning depends upon broad-based support and understanding which can only come about through participation and meaningful involvement. In dealing with groups of individuals from educational institutions over the years the author has noted how frequently people who work together every day still have very little real knowledge about one another. It is important to create an environment in which understanding and trust can develop. This enables the free expression of opinion so essential to effective planning.

The Activities

In the Yosemite district there are several major activities that go into planning. As with other aspects of the planning process these have evolved over time through trial and error and with considerable study and review by various persons. Ideas can come from virtually anywhere. If they work, we will use them.

The foundation for planning is information. Data in and of itself has no meaning or value. But, when placed in the hands of those people in a position to make judgements about the future of the institution facts and information can become powerful elements of planning. Early on it was noted by the developmental committees that a great deal of information already existed in the Yosemite district. The problem was, it was difficult to get to, was often hard to interpret, was too frequently buried in cumbersome printouts of computerized information or in some cases resided in the knowledge of one or two individuals dealing with that particular aspect of the operation. Needless to say this was not satisfactory. After much study it was decided to develop what came to be called *The Atlas*. The Atlas is a document which summarizes by management unit, college/central services and overall district pertinent external and internal information about students, services, facilities, finances and staff as well as economic trends, job market data and other similar information. The Atlas is backed up by detailed data summaries, organized by management unit and TOP (Taxonomy of Programs) code. Preparation of this document is the responsibility of the district director of research, Robin Richards. As one might

expect considerable reliance is placed upon the district's data management system in preparation of this document.

Another major activity is the preparation for planning which must be done by each planning unit. This entails a thorough examination of prior year outcomes, reexamination of the the unit's clientele, a review of the Board of Trustees Philosphical Guidelines, consideration of the unit's objectives in relation to overall college goals, examination of the data summaries and Atlas and consideration of recommendations from other units. In addition the unit may be working with advisory committees, doing some surveys of its own, evaluating the effectiveness of its programs in meeting stated objectives and other related activity. By pulling all this information together the unit members can begin the planning process itself in an informed manner.

In order to prepare the plan, the unit members - under the guidance of the unit manager - must arrive at a careful statement of objectives, develop the activities which they feel will assure reaching those objectives, determine the resources needed to perform the activities, assign priorities, make recommendations for other units, develop the rationale to support any suggested changes for their own unit and then combine all this into a unit plan. As this is being done the budget information from the plan must be put into the computer so that unit budgets can be aggregated into overall college/central services and district-wide plans.

In addition to unit level review, overall college/central services review must also be conducted. Goals have to be updated and revised. Conflicts in priorities have to be resolved. This is done by college/ central services level administrative personnel with input from special, broad-based advisory groups. Each of the colleges and central services approaches this task differently, but the intent is to provide an opportunity for representative review and input from all staff into the final product. Increased emphasis is being placed on this activity as the planning process matures.

The physical preparation of the plans has been decentralized to the unit level. Unit managers are responsible for the preparation of their unit plan in accordance with a prescribed format. They are also responsible for the input of budget data into the computer. The preparation of the college/central services plans is the responsibility of the respective college presidents and district chancellor. The district chancellor oversees the preparation of the overall district plan.

The Documentation

The basic documents coming out of the planning process are, in addition to the Atlas which has previously been described:

The Unit Plans which are documents containing a statement of the unit's function, a statement of the unit's objectives, the activities required to meet those objectives, the required resources (budget) with the activities and budget items linked and priortized, the rationale (recommendations for the unit), and a list of recommendations for other units.

The College/Central Services Plans which contain a statement of college mission, a statement of college goals and a list of special priorities reflecting the cumulative effect of the individual unit priorities. In addition the college plans will contain information required to meet some state level planning requirements for categorical programs such as DSP&S, EOP&S and VEA.

The overall District Comprehensive Plan which is developed in three major drafts: the First Draft of the Tentative Plan, the Final Draft of the Tentative Plan and the Final District Comprehensive Plan.

It is important to note that new procedures are now being implemented to permit making projections into the out years so that a five year plan may be more accurately prepared. Under the leadership of Pamila Fisher, Assistant Chancellor for Educational Services for the District, new forms and procedures have been developed to assist units in setting their long range goals and the budget necessary to achieve them. It is hoped that this will strengthen the projections contained in the District Comprehensive plan and enable more accurate long term planning. These procedures embody a philosophy that the first year out should and can be very accurately portrayed with decreasing accuracy and detail occuring the farther in the future events are being judged. Judging the future will always remain the most difficult and most significant part of planning.

The Results

After utilizing the comprehensive planning process in the Yosemite district for several years some positive results may be observed.

1. There has been a profound improvement in communication among all institutional constituencies. Having in place a common basis for transmission of recommendations; for receiving feedback; for obtaining information has facilitated communication.

2. Improved communication and a common basis for decision making has improved interpersonal relationships. A sense of *team* has emerged which enables a better focus on common institutional goals.

3. The decentralization of day-to-day decision making and budget management has strengthened the role of unit managers and improved the overall operation through improved decisions.

4. The centralization of information has greatly enhanced institutional ability to know the status of any or all activities at any time.

5. Through the planning process basic decisions regarding goals, activities and priorities are made more prudently and in a more timely manner. Decisions are made *up front* during the reconciliation of plans and not under the pressure of current events. The entire institution has input and all parties are aware of the final decisions. This has resulted in fewer reactive responses and more proactive activity.

In addition to these specific points, the fact that a District Comprehensive Plan exists; has been adopted by the Board of Trustees and is backed up by College/Central Services plans and the detail of the Unit plans provides the basis for firmly directing the institution as well as communicating internally and externally.

The Future

With this much accomplished what does the future hold for planning in the Yosemite district? Even with the progress made much remains to be done. Several strands of emphasis are emerging from the ongoing appraisal of the planning process.

1. There is a definite need for more research. To meet this need a Director of Research, Robin Richards, has been hired. A research advisory committee has been formed. Various research projects have been identified. As the results of the research are defined the appropriate response will be incorporated into the planning process.

2. Emphasis is now being placed on the strategic aspects of planning. Based on input from an ad hoc study committee forms and procdueres to be used by unit managers have been developed and implemented for use in developing the 1988-89 comprehensive plan. In addition, in-service activities to assist managers in utilizing information in making strategic decisions have been conducted. Of all the work going on this activity could prove to be the most significant over time. Predicting the future with any degree of accuracy is a process frought with hazards. However, we in education have, for too long, failed to work at it; a condition we can

no longer accept and be successful and competitive with other demands on resources.

3. More work will be done on helping staff with techniques for untilizing the information made available through the planning process. This is an activity that takes time and maturity and must be continuous and ongoing.

4. In addition work will be done on developing skills in group leadership and effective ways to secure staff input into the decision making process. Jim Temme, executive vice president of the American Cancer Society, Arizona Division, writing in the NonProfit World comments about the significance of *commitment* in reaching organizational objectives. He suggests that *"people do things for their reasons, not yours"* and to be a successful organization we must encourage employees to be creative in their thinkng and not always to accept organizational ideas; to not only accept change but to create change. The belief persists in the Yosemite district that decentralized decision making engaged in by people at all levels based on good information is where future success lies.

5. Another area beginning to be emphasized and which will receive increasing amounts of effort will be strengthening evaluation techniques. Not just in the instructional area, but throughout all units. The planning process through the identification of goals and activities provides the basis for sound evaluation. How to evaluate effectively and to use the resultant information in making future decisions (plans) becomes a significant activity as a planning process matures such as is happening in the Yosemite district.

6. Finally, an activity which holds the potential for considerable reduction in duplication of planning effort for meeting state mandates, the Statewide Comprehensive Planning Process, shows promise of implementation in the near future. The Yosemite district has been involved in this project from the beginning and will be completing its fourth district-wide plan this year. The ability to combine eighteen to twenty different required state planning documents into one comprehensive plan will save time and effort and give local districts as well as state level personnel a much more accurate portrayal of local activity. Even without that benefit, the encouragement the activity provides for local district planning can only result in improved community college programs, statewide.

Summary

The Yosemite Community College District has been engaged in the development and utilization of a districtwide comprehensive planning process since 1979-80. During this time a process has evolved which is based upon the premise that good, timely information should be readily available to all parties at all times for use in the decision making process. From this a systematic process has been developed for putting together each year, a comprehensive five year plan including a detailed operational year with goals and activities keyed to budget items. Management decision making has been decentralized at the same time information has been centralized.

In the Yosemite district it is believed that staff involvement and input is critical to the process; that there must be a free flow of information and a respect for and acceptance of differing opinions; that there must be feedback to the units and individual unit members regarding their plans; and that the process must be able to adjust and change as it matures.

All in all, comprehensive planning has resulted in greater efficiency, improved management and better service to district clientele.

YOSEMITE COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT PLANNING SUPPORT DOCUMENTS

1. Current Year Comprehensive Plan.

2. The ATLAS. "A Snapshot of the Yosemite Community College District, Its Facilties, Programs and People"

3. Comprehensive Planning Guide.

4. Outline For Unit Plan.

5. Accounting Manual For Comprehensive Planning.

6. Critical Issues: What do they mean for your Unit?

7. Proposed Planning Assumptions for 1988-89.

8. Statewide Priorities. Adapted from the Policy Statement on Statewide Community College Mission adopted by the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges in December 1983.

Copies of the above materials may be obtained by contacting:

Dr. Pamila J. Fisher
Assistant Chancellor, Educational Services
Yosemite Community College District
Post Office Box 4065
Modesto, CA 95352
(209) 575-6514

ANNUAL PLANNING TIMELINE

Timing		Activity	Who's Involved
July 1 - August 15	1.	Prepare planning documents.	Educational Services Staff, Chancellor, Board of Trustees
August 15 - 31	2.	Initial Planning Workshops to highlight critical issues.	DAC
September 1-30	3.	Planning Documents distributed & technical assistance meetings & services provided for unit managers & staff.	Educational Services Staff
September 1 - Nov 15	4.	Planning meetings conducted & individual "Unit Plans" developed.	Unit managers & Staff
Nov 15 - Dec 15	5.	Draft "Unit Plans" distributed to staff for further comment.	Unit managers
December 15	6.	Final "Unit Plans" submitted to the College President.	Unit managers
Dec 15 - Jan 15	7.	"Unit Plans" reviewed at the college level; comments provided to unit managers.	College Administration
Dec 15 - Jan 31	8.	"College and Central Services Plans" developed.	College Administration
Feb 1 - 15	9.	"College and Central Services Plans" reviewed by representative group.	College Administration
February 15	10.	"College and Central Services Plans" submitted to District Chancellor.	College Administration
Feb 15 - March 1	11.	"District Plan" drafted.	Educational Services Staff
March 1 - 15	12.	"District Plan" reviewed by representative subcommittee	DAC
March 15 - 31	13.	"District Plan" revised and approved	Board of Trustees Educational Services Staff
April	14.	"District Plan" submitted to CCC Chancellor's office	Educational Services Staff
April - July	15.	Budget revised to reflect revenue adjustments.	Chancellor Business Services
July	16.	Revised "District Plan" approved and submitted to CCC	Board of Trustees Educational Services Staff
September	17.	Final "District Plan" distributed	Board of Trustees Educational Services Staff

ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges SEP 22 1989